

**CALIFORNIA MARINE LIFE PROTECTION ACT INITIATIVE
MASTER PLAN SCIENCE ADVISORY TEAM
MAY 11, 2005 MEETING SUMMARY
Elihu Harris State Building
1515 Clay Street, Room 11
Oakland, California**

SAT members present: Loo Botsford, Mark Carr, Doyle Hanan, Rikk Kvitek, Will McClintock (representing Steve Gaines), Steven Murray, Mark Ohman, Jeff Paduan, Linwood Pendleton, Laura Rogers-Bennett, Susan Schlosser, Kenneth Schiff, Astrid Scholz, Rick Starr, Dean Wendt, Mary Yoklavich

SAT members not present: Steve Gaines, Steve Palumbi, Kevin Piner, Richard Young

Others present: Dr. Steve Barrager (chair, SAT), Heather Galindo (note taker; SAT support staff), Carrie Kappel (note taker; SAT support staff), John J. Kirlin (MLPA staff), John Ugoretz (DFG staff) and approximately eight members of the public

Acronyms used: California Department of Fish and Game (DFG), California Fish and Game Commission (F&GC), geographic information system (GIS), Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA), marine protected area (MPA), MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF), MLPA Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (CCRSG), MLPA Central Coast Science Sub-Team (SST), MLPA Master Plan Framework (MPF), MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT), MLPA Statewide Interests Group (SIG)

Introduction

John Ugoretz updated the group on MLPA developments at DFG. Patty Wolf has stepped down from her position as marine region manager. Gary Stacey, a long-term DFG biologist and manager, will be taking her position. The BRTF approved the MPF and passed it back to DFG, where minor revisions will take place. One important revision will be to include a requirement for a feasibility analysis in the steps involved in proposing alternative networks. This analysis should treat the feasibility of monitoring, enforcement, and implementation for individual MPAs within a network as well as the network as a whole. If any proposed alternative fails to meet DFG's feasibility requirements, it will be kicked back to the group that proposed it. John Ugoretz also mentioned that portions of the document will be undergoing peer review, and he asked for help from the SAT in documenting the portions of the MPF they worked on with appropriate references from the literature (see action items at the end of this meeting summary).

Steve Barrager reviewed the guidelines for effective decision-making processes, emphasizing the importance of using a good, straightforward decision process, involving the right people in the decision dialogue, and using powerful tools for communication: creativity and analysis. The SAT is currently in the framing phase of the decision process, engaged in framing its role and responsibilities and the tasks before it. Within the ongoing decision dialogue, the SAT's purview is data and assessment of alternatives, while that of the stakeholder group is the articulation and advocacy of values. Dynamic simulation and optimization models could be

potential tools used by the SAT to explore design concepts and assess trade-offs among alternative MPA network designs.

Science Advisory Team Guidelines

Continuing within the framing process, Steve Barrager presented a preliminary set of SAT guidelines he developed in conversations with Steve Murray, Mark Carr, and others.

There was extensive discussion among the SAT about these guidelines and general consensus that they required significant revision. Contradictions between DFG expectations for the SAT and the roles laid out for them in the draft guidelines were revealed in the course of the discussion. This discussion led to John Ugoretz's offer to revise the document to bring it more into line with the role envisioned by DFG and MLPA Initiative staff and outlined for the SAT in the MPF. In particular, the issue of whether the SAT can create and offer alternatives, whether they are alternative individual MPAs or MPA networks, was contentious. DFG and MLPA Initiative staff emphasized that the role of the SAT was not to propose alternatives, but rather to provide input and advice into the design process, stopping short of drawing lines on the map, and to critically evaluate proposed alternatives and make recommendations to the BRTF based on that evaluation. The SAT guidelines will be revised to better reflect and clarify these roles.

The following critical issues were raised in the discussion of the guidelines document:

Alternative generation versus evaluation

- DFG is not looking to the SAT to provide reserve network alternatives. The SAT can provide guidance, input and advice on features necessary in an effective network and will review the proposals developed, with the input of the SST, by the regional working groups.
- The way in which the SAT may provide input into features to be included in networks will depend on the timing, tone, and arena of their participation. The CCRSG must be given the time to wrestle with the important values issues first before scientific input is interjected into the process. As the CCRSG starts to consider alternatives, it will do so with the advice of the SST, and via that process, additional advice may be added to the MPF. The SAT will have a chance to weigh into the process by which the values developed in the regional planning process are implemented.
- SAT members have assumed from the beginning that they will provide guidance in the MPA network design process, but they are struggling with how best to do that. Clear guidelines and operating principles are required.

Communication and interaction with the BRTF

- The SAT can and should play a role in educating or informing the BRTF around pertinent science issues.

- Guidelines document should address interactions not only between individual SAT members and the BRTF, but also the SAT and BRTF as a whole.
- At least one SAT member should attend every BRTF meeting with Steve Barrager as an official representative of the SAT. This person would be able to field questions within the SAT's purview that arise during the meeting. They would also report back to the SAT on important scientific issues that arise during the BRTF meeting, either during scientific presentations, stakeholder input, public comment or BRTF discussion.
- There is a need for a formal process by which advice of the SAT is presented to the BRTF and to the public. Documents, recommendations, and other "official views" of the SAT developed by sub-committees or by the SAT as a whole must be vetted by the whole SAT before they are passed on to DFG, the BRTF, or the public.
- DFG/MLPA Initiative staff will notify the SAT of scientific issues to be discussed at upcoming BRTF meetings one to two weeks in advance. The SAT representative(s) to each BRTF meeting will be responsible for assessing SAT consensus on scientific issues to be considered by the BRTF prior to the BRTF meeting.

Communication of the "official views" of the SAT

- SAT discussions and recommendations are a matter of public record via the meeting notes and video recordings of the meetings. In addition, "official views" may be articulated in consensus documents produced by the SAT for use by the SAT, the BRTF, the regional stakeholder groups, or the public, or in presentations by the SAT to other bodies involved in the MLPA process.
- SAT members can be advocates for the use of science within this process and for the importance of a good decision-making process, but beyond that they should not act as advocates. Steve Barrager suggested they find others who can represent their personal opinions for them if they wish to advocate for a certain viewpoint in the process.
- Despite this, SAT members recognize that even scientifically grounded, consensus-derived recommendations may be perceived as 'advocacy' by members of the public.
- There is a need for guidelines for how the SAT will deal with scientific uncertainty in its decision-making and communications, e.g. SAT members should clearly represent areas where there is ambiguity or where key assumptions are being made.
- When it comes to matters of science, the SAT will best serve the process when it makes clear, unambiguous recommendations. Disagreements or differences of opinion should be made clear when they arise. The SAT should aim for clear, unambiguous recommendations based on the best available science and divorced from potential downstream implications of the recommendations.
- The SAT should describe explicitly the evidence for or against particular ideas and a description of how a given recommendation has been made, (e.g. it is based on weight-of-evidence analysis). When recommendations are based on modeling results or 'theory', some explanation of the level of support for a particular idea offered by these methods should be discussed.

- There are issues associated with SAT opinions/discussions being communicated by DFG or MLPA Initiative staff versus directly communicated by SAT members. If DFG or MLPA Initiative staff members make changes to SAT recommendations or documents, these must be communicated to and approved by the SAT before they are shared with the BRTF or public.

Communications by individual SAT members and interactions with the BRTF

- SAT members should not be construed as representing the SAT outside of SAT or other MLPA meetings. The MLPA Initiative and DFG staff can help SAT members to clearly distinguish when they are representing the SAT from when they are giving personal opinion, either as a scientist or as a citizen.

Communication with stakeholders (including the general public, stakeholder groups, the SIG, and the CCRSG)

- There must be a clear process whereby comments and questions from the public are communicated to and considered by the SAT. It is important to develop a two-way flow of information and communication between the SAT and stakeholders. Potential solutions include:
 - o Communication to the SAT of important feedback or questions from the public by Steve Barrager, John Ugoretz, John Kirlin, and any members of the SAT who attend BRTF meetings
 - o Presentations by stakeholder groups to the SAT
 - o Summarized communications from the SIG, the CCRSG, and any other formal stakeholder meetings to the SAT
 - o Reports to the SAT by the SST on the regional planning process
 - o Creation of a SAT public comment/question line 1-800-SAT-MLPA and an online portal for public comments/questions to the SAT on the MLPA Initiative website

Dealing with data requests from the public or stakeholder groups

- There was strong discomfort expressed by members of the group with the wording in the section about data requests. In particular, the absoluteness of the language made individuals uncomfortable, especially given the time and funding constraints under which the SAT operates. SAT members receive many requests for data or scientific advice. They expressed concern that it would be overly burdensome to respond to and log every data request of this sort.
- In addition, SAT members do not control decisions about spending for data acquisition, though they can make resource requests of DFG and/or the MLPA Initiative. Jeff Paduan offered to rewrite this section.
- The SAT's roles with regard to data acquisition and data sharing cannot be completely delineated without more complete articulation of how the SAT and the SST will interact with the CCRSG.

Use of simulation or optimization models

- Such models may be used by the SAT to simulate alternative network designs, explore important design concepts, and assess trade-offs among designs based on different sets of values, goals, and objectives.
- These models should not be used by the SAT to produce specific alternative reserve networks.
- Optimization models depend on values and objectives as their inputs. Articulating values is not within the purview of the SAT. If the SAT intends to use such models, it will need input from stakeholders on the relative weighting of their values and priorities (e.g. fisheries production, recreational access, ecotourism potential, the preservation of particular species or habitats). The SAT itself should not be engaged in weighting values, and it could be very difficult to get regional working group members to come to consensus around the weighting of different values.
- Such models may be useful to scientists, but may have less perceived utility among stakeholders.

Review of BRTF Decisions from Pasadena

Kirlin reviewed decisions made by the BRTF at its April 11-12 meeting in Pasadena. Pigeon Point to Point Conception was approved as the MLPA Central Coast Study Region. The MPF, which included significant SAT input on design principles, habitat, and biogeographic regions, was approved and sent on to DFG. A revised MPF will be conveyed to the F&GC on May 23 at the joint meeting with the BRTF in Sacramento.

The process by which SAT input was incorporated into the MPF is proving instructive. Around design principles and habitat, draft language from the SAT was incorporated in the MPF early enough for public comment and subsequent revision. The biogeographic regions section took a different course. It was on a delayed schedule and consequently was not vetted by the entire SAT nor was it available for public comment prior to the BRTF's decision. The discussion of biogeographic regions had been framed in all public documents as a choice between 2, 3, or 4 regions. Discussion by the SAT did not alter the framing of the decision. Kirlin explained to the BRTF that there was best support scientifically for dividing the area into two regions, (based on the well recognized biogeographic break at Point Conception). He recommended that the additional information on bioregions be used to supplement the regional design processes.

Kirlin apologized for not getting SAT input and roles in the BRTF meeting well organized ahead of time. Kirlin suggested that biogeographic region recommendations made to the BRTF on behalf of the SAT could be revisited as the process of implementing and refining the MPF is intended to be adaptive. The SAT will reconsider the biogeographic regions question at their next meeting and try to develop a clear, unambiguous recommendation.

Central Coast Regional Stakeholder Group

John Kirlin reported that membership of the 32-person CCRSG would be announced shortly. This will be a well-balanced group that includes a wide range of different stakeholders, including scientists and science educators (scientists being treated as another stakeholder group in this portion of the process). A new staff has been retained to support the group, including Michael DeLapa, central coast project manager, and Dr. Mary Gleason of The Nature Conservancy, as well as a facilitation team, CONCUR, with deep experience in environmental conflict resolution. Two members of CONCUR, Scott McCreary and Eric Poncelet, will be working with the group. The CCRSG will be divided into north and south sub-teams in order to maximize access to relevant planning information and minimize travel times. The CCRSG will work hand in hand with the SST; the first meeting will be June 8 and 9 in Monterey. Money has been earmarked to support the planning process and pay for additional research in socioeconomics, assessment of existing MPAs, and development of monitoring and evaluation plans. Ecotrust has been contracted to collect additional data on fishing use. Non-consumptive use data are also being collected. Both will be available for the sub-regions by August.

Participants on the SST include: Mary Yoklavich, Laura Rogers-Bennett, Rick Starr, Mark Carr, Dean Wendt, Linwood Pendleton, Doyle Hanan, Steve Palumbi, Steve Gaines, Rikk Kvitek, and Steve Barrager. This group plans to meet prior to the June 8-9 meeting, in addition to having as many members as possible attend that meeting. Steve Murray indicated that he was willing to give input into intertidal areas where he has worked on the central coast.

SAT and Central Coast Regional Working Group

The discussion of the SAT and CCRSG document also provoked significant discussion around the roles and responsibilities of the SAT. In particular, the question of whether the duties of the SAT are purely reactive, (e.g. evaluation, assessment) or also proactive (e.g. proposal of alternatives) was a point of discussion. Specific comments relating to sections of the document are listed below. This document will also be revised with input from DFG staff and SAT members, who were encouraged to generate a list of questions to be answered and topics to be addressed within its pages, with a goal of creating a set of clear operating rules for participation.

Goals and objectives

The SAT discussed a variety of goals and objectives for its interaction with the CCRSG, including:

- To interpret and evaluate the extent to which proposed alternatives meet the scientific goals articulated in the MLPA;
- To identify and provide relevant datasets to support alternative generation by the CCRSG and evaluation of those alternatives by the SAT;
- To develop tools and approaches during the central coast study region effort that can be used in planning efforts in the rest of the state. These tools and approaches should

allow the coordination and scaling up of the regional working groups' products to meet the overall statewide network goals.

Members of the SAT objected to language in this section that seemed to suggest that they absolutely would use simulation or optimization models to generate alternatives. This language will be revised to reflect the fact that the SAT *may* use these models to explore design concepts and evaluate trade-offs, if it decides they are useful.

Design approaches that include all three types of MPAs

This section should reflect the lack of theory available to deal with different types of MPAs and their effects. The three types of MPAs could be seen as representing a gradient in harvest pressure. The SAT could explore the design implications of this variation in harvest intensity and develop some concrete principles to guide the use of these different types of MPAs in network design. The idea of ocean zoning might be brought to bear under this heading.

Developing alternative sets of MPAs

As with the SAT guidelines document, this section requires some revision to clarify SST members' roles in helping the CCRSG to generate alternatives. According to DFG staff, the SAT and SST should provide guidance on 'concepts' and provide information about trade-offs without outlining specific alternatives. In essence, the SAT can come up with recommendations and guidelines for *how* lines should be drawn on maps, but should not engage in actually drawing those lines on the maps themselves. This is the purview of the CCRSG. Language about using simulation models to develop alternatives will be revised or removed to reflect this.

DFG and MLPA Initiative staff expect SST members to be involved in a dialogue with the regional stakeholders, providing scientific information and advice that can inform their decision-making. SST members will not have voting rights or decision-making power in that process. Outputs of that process will be brought to the SAT for evaluation.

Concern was expressed that this framework treats scientists as "second-class citizens" and might not result in the strong use of science in the decision-making process.

Assessing existing MPAs

This should include assessing biological, sociological, and economic impacts of existing MPAs and other regulations.

Identifying and assessing revised or new MPAs

Again there was a contradiction between the expectations of DFG and MLPA Initiative staff and those of the SAT chair around whether the SAT would be involved in proposing new individual MPAs.

Clarifying likely outcomes of alternatives

It was suggested that language be added to make clear up front that SAT members may act as principal investigators, staff or consultants on projects aimed at collecting additional data to support the MLPA Initiative, and that some of those projects may be funded by the MLPA Initiative.

Participating in the regional planning meetings

All SST members are encouraged to attend all CCRSG meetings, but at a minimum, one member of the SST must be present at every meeting. One person should act as a liaison between the CCRSG and the rest of the SST and the SAT to make sure communication channels are open. It is not clear yet whether SST members will sit at the table and participate though this is likely; this will be left up to the professional facilitators to decide. Questions of substance that arise in the CCRSG process should be logged and both questions and answers communicated to and from the SAT with transparency. This could be proposed as a task for the professional facilitators. Evaluation of alternatives generated by the CCRSG will take place within SAT meetings, separate from the CCRSG.

Assessing Spatial Data Needs

Laura Rogers-Bennett and Will McClintock reported on progress in developing an extensive GIS database that would house a suite of data layers that might be used by the public, the SAT and the regional working groups moving forward. The data will be housed on an ArcIMS server and be accessible to the public via the worldwide web. An anticipated 300 gigabytes of data will be available for online access or download. Will McClintock will be maintaining the database, which will be based at UC Santa Barbara in Steve Gaines' lab. This database is a joint project of DFG, NOAA's MPA Science Center, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, and The Nature Conservancy; it will house shared data from all these entities with version control that will ensure that everyone is working from the most current datasets.

Rogers-Bennett emphasized the need for the SAT to think strategically now about how they would like to use this database, what questions they would like to answer with it, and what data need to be in it. She articulated the need to move from the somewhat vague goals like "ecosystem health" laid out in the MLPA to quantitative, measurable indicators and metrics. This top-down approach will highlight data needs. It should be accompanied by a pragmatic bottom-up approach that takes into account current data availability. Rogers-Bennett distributed a list of the current data layers in the database and gave the team two weeks to review this list and address the following questions:

1. What of this list would be most important to help you and/or the stakeholders make decisions?
2. Which data will be most useful to have in an online format?

John Ugoretz reminded the group that any tools or analyses the SAT planned to provide for the CCRSG would need to be ready by July, when the central coast planning process begins in earnest.

Will McClintock strongly encouraged the group to generate a list of ways in which they anticipated using this database and questions they hoped to answer with it, so that it can be structured most effectively to facilitate those uses.

The SAT discussed whether this database would be duplicative of efforts already being put into OceanMap (the GIS interface developed by Environmental Defense and Ecotrust) and used to collect new information on use patterns. McClintock remarked that the UCSB GIS could be similarly modified to allow data collection in this way if this were a priority for the group. In addition, data collected by Environmental Defense and Ecotrust can easily be added to this database.

Central Coast Regional Profile

John Ugoretz presented the draft regional profile outline put together by Paul Reilly for the central coast study region. The regional profile will be used by the CCRSG and SST and must be ready by July. Some items on this list will be developed in partnership with the SAT. John asked the SAT to consider:

1. Are there other items that should be added to the regional profile to assist in decision-making?
2. Are there items on this list that the SAT could help prepare?

Individual SAT members volunteered to work on specific pieces of the profile (see list of action items at the end of this summary). The whole SAT was asked to review the list of species likely to benefit from MPAs, which was developed by the original master plan team, for additions, removals and other edits. Bill Sydeman was volunteered to think about birds, mammals, and other large animals that are currently not on the list. Revisions will be discussed at the next SAT meeting. The species list has been revised, eliminating species that are rare or unknown on the central coast, and adding a description of the various life history traits that caused the master plan team to target those species for inclusion in the list originally.

SAT members provided some initial feedback on the draft regional profile outline. Rocky shoreline use, including educational uses of the shoreline, visitation and ecotourism, and the presence of high use areas, was mentioned as an important category to add. Intertidal habitats will be included in the habitat types description and Steve Murray will help to pull together available information on high use shoreline areas. The non-consumptive use study will also address tidepooling as an activity. Aquaculture activity and access points for subsistence fishing and diving were also suggested for addition to the regional profile. Astrid Scholz suggested a dataset for subsistence fishing that has been collected out of Santa Barbara.

Issues to be Considered the During Central Coast Study Region Planning Process

The SAT engaged in a brainstorming exercise designed to identify as many of the issues that need to be considered during the central coast study region planning process as possible.

Issues raised by SAT members

- Reframing of MLPA goals into testable science questions with reference to network design and communication of the answers to those questions back to the process
- Identification of the biological or ecological communities or systems that can be most effectively protected using MPAs
- Awareness of the perceptions of the SAT by the CCRSG with regard to roles, process, responsibilities, limitations, etc.
- Development of clear operating principles for the SAT
- Ensuring that appropriate habitats and identifiable control sites are included in networks to allow for rigorous scientific evaluation of MPA performance and long term monitoring
- Coordination of MPAs with existing state and federal fishery management strategies
- Consideration of human population growth and other demographic changes in long-term planning
- Accounting for the disproportionate amount of expertise and knowledge in the northern group of the central coast study region
- Balanced discussion of diverse uses and stakeholder groups, not just commercial fishing
- Staying within the formal expectations of the process, not over-reaching
- Balanced consideration of both ecosystem and fishery goals
- Clear articulation of the role of scientific uncertainty in environmental and socioeconomic data and in the planning process.
- Consideration of the value of MPAs in estimating fishing effects and incorporation of that goal into the design process by the CCRSG and the BRTF
- Development of quantitative goals and adaptive management endpoints for the central coast study region so that adaptive management strategies can work
- Effective monitoring
- Effects of spatial reserve configuration of reserves on population persistence and fishery yield
- Incorporation of an ecosystem perspective versus a single species perspective
- Need for the development of specific questions to be answered using the geodatabase
- A process that works
- Well articulated roles and responsibilities for the SAT, developed with SAT input

- Consideration of how the spatial distribution of human populations along the coast might affect the acceptability of certain MPA locations and the magnitude and timing of the subsequent ecosystem response to protection within those MPAs
- Cost-benefit analysis of MPA implementation
- Development of techniques for inclusion of non-commercial uses, which are not easily quantified, in the cost-benefit analysis
- Clear process for achieving consensus within the SAT before interacting with other groups such as the BRTF and regional stakeholder groups
- Improved communication between the CCRSG and SAT
- Momentum and a good model with which to finish this process for the rest of the state
- Adherence to the time schedule; public outreach and communication to avoid surprises, particularly towards end of process
- Clear distinction between deliberations and facts when SAT views are presented to groups outside the SAT; clarity about levels of consensus
- Devotion of sufficient time and effort by SAT members to developing evaluation methodologies for the MPAs
- Consideration of the fact that the central coast, as the pilot study region, might not include factors important to other regions in the state (e.g. water quality)
- Documentation of failures of process versus failures in knowledge
- Consideration of scientific data when lines on the map are drawn
- Attention to and energy input into the phases of implementation and monitoring that come after the design process
- Early assessment of feasibility of alternatives with advice from DFG

Issues raised by the public

- Importance of achieving an outcome informed and influenced by science and ensuring that science-based outcome is not undone by the F&GC
- Very clear lines of communication among public, SAT, CCRSG, SIG, etc.
- Limited opportunities for SAT to provide input into network design
- Requirement for concise, focused input from the SAT, based on consensus opinion of its members
- Attention to data, products, tools, etc that might be useful for future planning regions
- Ability to communicate SAT advice clearly without jargon to non-scientists especially those in the CCRSG

Evaluation of Existing Central Coast Study Region MPAs

John Ugoretz distributed the draft evaluation of existing MPAs document (available online). Recommendations about existing MPAs that used to be in this document have been removed.

It now just includes: existing MPAs with their site name, history, area, shoreline length, depth range, (area, length and depth numbers are prone to errors, but DFG is working on fixing them), habitat types, existing regulations, primary objectives (though many existing MPAs didn't have any original goals or objectives), existing enforcement, baseline and ongoing monitoring and research studies, published and unpublished references (numbers refer to the bibliography number), and a basic evaluation. The SST was asked to focus on the 13 areas included in the central coast study region: ranging from the special closure at Año Nuevo down to Vandenberg State Marine Reserve.

John Ugoretz requested that the SST:

- (1) Think about what data or assessment are needed for the existing MPA evaluation. Consider whether we can get that data via hired contract help; and
- (2) Read through and evaluate the descriptions, lists of existing studies, habitat types, and basic evaluations.

The ongoing evaluation of existing MPAs by Charlie Wahle and colleagues at NOAA's National MPA Science Center was discussed as a potential source of additional information.

Overall Meeting Evaluation by Participants

What worked well

- Had the flexibility to address important issues when they arose

What did not work well

- Skipped around in the agenda without explanation or clear reason
- Spent too much time editing documents online
- Did not have all the pertinent documents ahead of time
- Did not end on time

Issues that remain

- Need to develop a clear process by which decisions are made by the SAT
- Need a clear point at which things become consensus
- Need to finalize SAT guidelines
- Need clarity around where and when SAT is empowered to make choices
- Status of draft MPF needs to be made clear
- Need to formalize how the SAT can educate the BRTF (with a coordinated set of presentations that cover the wide range of topics at once)
- Need to continue to improve the communication of upcoming agenda items, preparation requirements, items to be discussed, and decisions to be made, prior to each SAT meeting

- May need to meet more often in order to meet the challenges of this fast-moving, complex process
- Need to continue to pay attention to the draft MPF and the BRTF while turning our primary energy toward the central coast planning process
- Need to clarify the role of staff versus SAT in communicating SAT views to the BRTF

Action Items

1. Literature references for SAT advice in draft MPF
Send to John Ugoretz
2. SAT guidelines document
John Ugoretz will revise document and send back out to SAT. Jeff Paduan will help on section on the central coast study area. Steve Barrager and Steve Murray will also be involved.
3. List of questions spatial data will help answer
Necessary to structure how database information will be made available online
Send to Will McClintock
4. SAT representative needed for BRTF/DFG meeting on May 23 in Sacramento
5. List of existing datasets/data layers and functionality of database DUE MAY 25
Send to Laura Rogers-Bennett
6. Items to add to regional profile list DUE JULY 1
Send to John Ugoretz
7. Contribution of regional profile products DUE JULY 1
 - a. Habitat Types - Rikk Kvitek
 - b. Oceanic Features - Jeff Paduan
 - c. High Use Area Data - Steve Murray
 - d. Subsistence Fishing Areas - Astrid Scholz
 - e. Fisheries Data - Kevin Piner
 - f. Economic Values of Fisheries - Richard Young*Work with Paul Reilly*
8. Review list of species likely to benefit from MPAs DUE JULY 1, 2005
William Sydeman – Birds, mammals, sea turtles
Whole SAT to review
Work with Paul Reilly
9. List of potential contributions to the central coast planning process from SAT (Reactive & Proactive) DUE JULY 6, 2005
Jeff Paduan and anyone else

Bring to next meeting

10. Review evaluations of existing 13 MPAs between Año Nuevo and Vandenberg State Marine Reserve DUE JULY 6, 2005

Members of Central Coast SST (Led by Mark Carr and Rick Starr)

- a. What data or assessments are needed, and can these be obtained through contracts?
- b. Read and evaluate descriptions, lists of existing studies, habitat types, and basic evaluations.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

1. Revisit discussion of biogeographic regions
2. Central coast study region stakeholder group members
3. Discussion of species likely to benefit from MPAs
4. Central coast regional profile
5. SAT guidelines document
6. Discussion of potential contributions from the SAT
7. Evaluations of existing MPAs in central coast study region

The next SAT meeting will be on July 6, 2005. Location TBD.